Case: 4:11-cv-00720 Doc. #: 1 Filed: 04/21/11 Page: 1 of 4 PageID #: 1

%JS 44 (Rev. 11/04)

CIVIL COVER SHEET

The JS 44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service of pleadings or other papers as required by law, except as provided by local rules of court. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the purpose of initiating

the civil docket sheet. (SEE INSTRUCTIONS ON THE REVERSE OF THE FORM.) I. (a) PLAINTIFFS			DEFENDANTS				
Centimark Corporation				Philip J. Christofferson			
12 Grandvie	w Circle, Canonsh	ourg, PA 15317			r Road, St. Louis	s, MO 63127	
(b) County of Residence	of First Listed Plaintiff	Washington Co Pi	A	County of Residence	of First Listed Defendant	St. Louis County MC	
	EXCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF C.	ASES)	***************************************	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	(IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CAS		
				1	ND CONDEMNATION CASES INVOLVED.	S, USE THE LOCATION OF THE	
(c) Attorney's (Firm Name	c, Address, and Telephone Numb	er)		Attorneys (If Known)			
JohnJ. Allan,	11 S. Newstead <i>P</i> 0 63108 314-531-24	\venue		, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,			
II. BASIS OF JURISE			III CI	TIZENSHIP OF I	PRINCIPAL DADTH	ES(Place an "X" in One Box for Plainti	
		" One Dox Only)		For Diversity Cases Only)		and One Box for Defendant)	
☐ 1 U.S. Government Plaintiff	(U.S. Government	1 Not a Party)	Citizo		TF DEF I Incorporated of Business In	PTF DEF r Principal Place 1 4 8 4 This State	
2 U.S. Government Defendant	₩ 4 Diversity (Indicate Citizens)	hip of Parties in Item III)	Citize	n of Another State	2 2 Incorporated an of Business	nd Principal Place B 5 G 5 In Another State	
				n or Subject of a 📑 eign Country	3 S Foreign Nation	16 1 6	
IV. NATURE OF SUITE CONTRACT			T grown to				
110 Insurance	PERSONAL INJURY	RTS PERSONAL INJURY		EITURE/PENALTY	BANKRUPTCY 1 422 Appeal 28 USC 158	OTHER STATUTES	
☐ 120 Marine ☐ 130 Miller Act ☐ 140 Negotiable Instrument ☐ 150 Recovery of Overpayment	☐ 310 Airplane ☐ 315 Airplane Product Liability ☐ 320 Assault, Libel & Slander ☐ 330 Federal Employers' Liability ☐ 340 Marine ☐ 345 Marine Product Liability ☐ 350 Motor Vehicle ☐ 355 Motor Vehicle ☐ 355 Motor Vehicle ☐ 400 Other Personal Injury CIVIL RIGHTS ☐ 441 Voting ☐ 442 Employment ☐ 443 Housing/ Accommodations ☐ 444 Welfare ☐ 445 Amer, w/Disabilities - Employment ☐ 446 Amer, w/Disabilities - Other	☐ 362 Personal Injury - Med. Malpractice ☐ 365 Personal Injury - Product Liability ☐ 368 Asbestos Personal Injury Product Liability PERSONAL PROPERT ☐ 370 Other Fraud ☐ 371 Truth in Lending ☐ 380 Other Personal Property Damage ☐ 385 Property Damage ☐ 385 Property Damage Product Liability PRISONER PETITIONS ☐ \$10 Motions to Vacate Sentence Habeas Corpus: ☐ 530 General ☐ 535 Death Penalty	O 6.6 O 6.6 O 6.6 O 6.6 O 7.1 O 7.2 O 7.2 O 7.3 O 7.9	10 Agriculture 10 Other Food & Drug 15 Drug Related Seizure of Property 21 USC 881 10 Liquor Laws 10 R.R. & Truck 10 Airline Regs. 10 Occupational Safety/Health 10 Other LABOR 10 Fair Labor Standards Act 10 Labor/Mgmt. Relations 10 Labor/Mgmt. Reporting 10 Bisclosure Act 10 Railway Labor Act 10 Other Labor Litigation 11 Empl. Ret. Inc. 12 Security Act	□ 422 Appeal 28 USC 188 □ 423 Withdrawal	□ 400 State Reapportionment □ 410 Antirust □ 430 Banks and Banking □ 450 Commerce □ 460 Deportation □ 470 Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations □ 480 Consumer Credit □ 490 Cable/Sat TV □ 810 Selective Service 856 Securities/Commodities/ Exchange □ 875 Customer Challenge □ 12 USC 3410 □ 890 Other Statutory Actions □ 891 Agricultural Acts □ 892 Economic Stabilization Act □ 893 Environmental Matters □ 894 Energy Allocation Act □ 895 Freedom of Information Act □ 900Appeal of Fee Determination Under Equal Access to Justice □ 950 Constitutionality of State Statutes	
Original C 2 Ro		Remanded from Appellate Court	4 Reinst	ated or 🐸 🤌 anothe	erred from	Appeal to District Judge from Magistrate	
/I. CAUSE OF ACTIO	Cite the U.S. Civil Sta	tute under which you are tuse:			d statutes unless diversity)	on Judgment :	
/II. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT;		IS A CLASS ACTION	DE	MANDS	CHECK YES onl	y if demanded in complaint:	
/III. RELATED CASE IF ANY	(See instructions):	JUDGE		interior (Control of Control of C	DOCKET NUMBER	- ar and the two	
ATE 04/21/2011		SIGNATURE OF ATTO	RNEYO	RECORD			
OR OFFICE USE ONLY	- HW	over de la company de la compa		er mermet der hier der der der der der der der der der d	Epitamentakan kanan arang arang daran daran kanan		
RECEIPT# AN	MOUNT / /	APPLYING IFP		JUDGE	MAG. JU	DGE	

Case: 4:11-cv-00720 Doc. #: 1 Filed: 04/21/11 Page: 2 of 4 PageID #: 2

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF MISSOURI EASTERN DIVISION

CENTIMA	RK CORPORATION)
Plair	ntiff,	
	vs CHRISTOFFERSON L AND CHRISTOFFERSON	CAUSE NO.:) JURY DEMAND IS MADE)
Defe	endants.)
Serve at:	3660 S. Geyer Rd St. Louis, MO 63127))

COMPLAINT

COMES NOW Plaintiff, CENTIMARK CORPORATION, and for its cause of action alleges the following:

JURISDICTION

- 1. The Plaintiff is a Pennsylvania corporation where it also has its principle place of business.
- 2. Philip J. Christofferson is a resident of Missouri and he is licensed to practice law in that state.
- 3. Jurisdiction is based on 28 USC 1332 because there is complete diversity of citizenship and the amount in controversy is over \$75,000 exclusive of interest and costs.
- 4. Cockreil and Christofferson, L.L.C. is a Missouri professional limited liability company and does its principle business in Missouri.

Case: 4:11-cv-00720 Doc. #: 1 Filed: 04/21/11 Page: 3 of 4 PageID #: 3

COUNT I – PROFESSIONAL NEGLIGENCE

- 5. On February 18, 2008 and up to September, 2009, there was an attorney/client relationship between the Plaintiffs and the Defendants, Philip J. Christofferson and Cockreil and Christofferson, L.L.C.
- 6. Between the start of the relationship and at various times up to September, 2009, the Defendants failed to use the degree of skill, care and learning ordinarily used in similar situations by members of the legal profession.
- 7. Specifically, after being retained by CentiMark in litigation brought by Liberty Mutual Insurance as subrogee of *Loy Lange Box Company v. CentiMark* Case No. 4:08-cv-00230-DJS, in the United State District Court in St. Louis, the defendants
 - a) Failed to zealously represent its interests by taking depositions of three or more material witnesses for the opposition party to determine what basis there was for the adverse parties claim.
 - b) Failed to list appropriate witnesses to defend the opponents claims in the times designated by the case management orders and therefore their testimony was unavailable at trial;
 - c) Failed to prepare the witnesses who were deposed by the opposition so that they could recall facts from earlier events,
 - d) Failed to make appropriate discovery requests for documents and failed to produce documents that would have aided the defense resulting in a partial summary judgment being entered against CentiMark and wiping out its defenses.
 - e) Failed to list or designate an expert witness on weather and roofing to demonstrate the winds were in excess of the guaranties of the subject roof.
 - f) Failed to plead contributory negligence and raise the economic loss doctrine as complete defenses and bars to the plaintiff's claims.
 - g) Failed to name the correct party in a counterclaim which resulted in that party's dismissal and attempts to correct the error were made outside the times for such amendments set by the court.

Case: 4:11-cv-00720 Doc. #: 1 Filed: 04/21/11 Page: 4 of 4 PageID #: 4

h) Failed to fully investigate the facts and circumstances at issue in the case.

As a result of the negligence on the part of the Defendants, CentiMark was

damaged when it sustained a verdict against it in the amount of \$450,000 on a claim which,

based on reasonable legal certainty, would either not have survived summary judgment, been a

defendant's verdict, or a verdict in an amount substantially less than it was, if the standard of

care was met.

8.

9. But for the negligence and the various breaches of the standard of skill, care, and

learning set forth above, the CentiMark would have received a verdict of no liability, or a verdict

in an amount substantially less than it was, if the standard of care was met.

WHEREFORE, the Plaintiff prays for a judgment against the Defendants, joint and

several, in an amount that is compensatory and determined to be fair by a jury and for all orders

as the court finds necessary and proper.

ALLAN & SUMMARY

By /s/ John J. Allan

JOHN J. ALLAN, #19079

11 S. Newstead

St. Louis, Missouri 63108

Phone 314-531-2442

Fax 314-531-2485

jja@allanlaw.com

YUKEVICH, MARCETTI, LIEKAR, ZANGRILLE

JOHN P. LIEKAR, JR.,

11 Stanwix Street, 10th Floor

Pittsburg, PA 15222

Phone 412-261-6779

Fax 412-261-6789

iliekar@ymlz.com

3